Dear Gary, 11/14/69

With luck I'll be able to answer your 11/10 before lunch, then will resume correcting COUP add. Check on Betzner, Nichols enclosures.

It is true that I been been feeling better for a while. But the past several days nove not been as good. I do not know whether this relates to the discontinuance of the equanil or not, but I took three yesterday, and if I hadn't been determined, I'd have had two attacks of the hyperventilaation bit. Today not bad. As you once said, it seems to be free-floating. I can relate this with nothing. Perhaps I'll have to keep a blood-lebel of the equanil for a while, so I'll go back on it. I hate to depend on a drug, as with my back I got rid of the brace, and that slight cost now is a real one.

Sorry you cannot tell me about Brener, the book, etc. My interests here are counterintelligence, nothing else. Presume your source is Mary. Moo thinks Rick Townley may have had something to do with it. The book itself interests me not at all. Some of the quotes had to comefrom inside the office. If this means Box, then he had funny ideas before dismissal. If Gurvich, not as much as he could and should have had, because he had the intent in time to reall collect things and, I believe, the thing that in particular made me thing of Tom dated to after his departure. But if you cannot tell me, it'll have to wait. I tell you, however, that I am more concerned about "security" and "counter-intelligence", to use words not really applicable to us, than I have ever been. We are fewer now and we are closer to nitty-gritty in many areas.

On Davison I said nobody, not nobody but. I am disappointed that you still have this immature attitude, that you do not really understand the need for care, which means not only that Mary is, in your opinion, trustworthy. There is just no reason to use any means of communication when it is not essential in any tender area. I cannot force you or Paul on this, but I sure as hell can get good and disgusted at all the time I can waste trying to keep you from these self-destructive, childish indulgences, which are really too much like that business of Hal flasking the letter. This is an emotional thing with you. You like her so you want to give her everything -even after you know that she has not sent what she was asked for-and some of it after many months. I do not make this as an accusation, but I suggest that you go back over your letters about how she works. I have no reason to mistrust Mary. I like her. Shall I run off a list of others of whom this was once also true? I haven't even asked her, "do you know anything about Aleksei Davison?", although it might be a good idea if you do. If she says no, and asks why, just say he was in the Embassy in Moscow when LHO was in the USSR. If she says yes, she can also tell you what. But there is nothing you can expect her to contribute to this for she cannot keep up with the work she is into now. Therefore, there is no reason to do what amounts of advertise what may be a deeply significant lead. Unless I have your assurance that you will not give anyone else antyhing I send you, I'm going to have to stop it, for this is one more worry I am not going to assume, especially now. I have enough without it. There also remains the special interpretations those people give their stuff. How far to the right Mary is I neither know nor care, but a few of the cracks she made about liberals make me wonder. My experience with people in that spectrum is that they convert things to fit these political preconceptions. This may not be true of her. When I learn it I will be happier. Until I do I will be alert. There are other little thijgs, too, like her wanting what I had on Shaw-Lawrence-rentals. I sent it, with a few line missing. She had that one (and copied and sent me the page I had inadvertently omitted), thatked me for the pages she did not have, but sent nothing except the phone-book check. Now this is inconsistent with what you wrote me, with anything but the holding of a suspicion. I am satisfied she knows more of the N.O. end of it.

She and Arch told me many interesting things. I told them which interested me and asked for some. To date, nothing, and I strongly urge you not to remind her, as you say you will. In fact, if you mention any of this to anyone, the extra thicknes a foresighted nature gave your skull will be inadequate. ~~Ixxxxxt~~ I trust you because I believe there is ample reason to. This means ~~in~~ in every way, including judgement and maturity....Play it cool and let us see what happens. I've offered them access to everything. I let them have what I shouldn't have, the prints from the film. You took so much of your stuff there and left it for copying. (I hope this included nothing I sent you, regardless of how innocent). I have yet to see a thing, and if you were given anything, you have yet to report it. Except a heavy dose of stardust.

You fool yourself if you think your complaint about interferences with your mail will either accomplish any good are worry anybody else. Making the kind if bargain you report and apparently depend uppn is like cohabitating with an octopus. You have yet to comment, but I think there is sufficient indication that somewhere along the line it is a possibility if not a probability. Currently.

Basically you are right about not spreading our beliefs about Dave, yet there are times, as~~i~~ in response to a letter I just got~~f~~ from Edelman, where some of it is necessary. I'll send you a copy. I have dropped it with Paul, who is the likely offender, as I have stopped sending him anything I consider sensitive where he is not involved and working on it. (Yet you would put Mary in a position to make an accidental slip, for no constructive purpose?)

You tell me what I told you a year ago about Fred. What you quote may be just twisting, but some of it may not have happened, I doxnot now recall. I do know it is not likely exactly what Bradley said, but it may have been. It is anything but what he told me. What did Fred expect him to get from me? a magic wand? A case against Mark? For your information, there is no information I have any reason to believe Bradley has that would interest me, and I spent no time "trying to pump him for information". He promised to send me some things on the Minutemen type fighting him, but I've not gotten it. He asked me to get him Roger's testimony, and I got it and sent it to him, with neither acknowledgement of repayment yet. I spent much time with him, drove him many miles, had him to supper, provided him with transportation to Baltimore, etc. and, if he listens to me, saved him much money. The business of the books is close to accurate. I asked him about you writing a book, knowing you have no such plans, because he had indicated that and I wanted to know why he indicated it. He said he misspoken himself, or something like that. I may well have asked him if he knew Lifton, but I do not remember it. He also denied knowing Steve Burton, which I know is a lie. I felt him out my way and still decided to help him. I did get for Gene the assurance N.O. had no interest in him, and he said he appreciated it. Something wrong with that? He had asked me this when he phoned me and I got the answer. So far as calling him collect, what is wrong with that? Neither the phone call nor any of the other costs, though minor (which are still major for me) were not for me but for him. He said he wanted to see Jim, that he had written often and goten no response, and I did it for him. I did not offer to go to N.O. for him, and I did not ~~thinxxxxxxxly~~ hint that I needed the money. I said it was impossible for me to go there because I am entirely without funds. I also said that if the time casme when he might want me to go there I might do it, but I did not visualize this. I told him that after the election, I would see if I could help him get what he wants, and I also told him Jim was not about to give him what could hurt Mark or Turner. Fred is really a bastard or reall sick-or both. "All Gene got was Hall's son's name...for all this time and expense. I'm sorry I encouraged Gene to see Harold." Why did he give this "encouragement" and why was I not alerted to it? Waht did he expect to get from me (and he got much more that he can use and wanted-or at least said he did. All that time and expense means a bus trip from Phila, nothing more, for he was there on McIntire business. I told him Bud would tell him nothing and knew nothing he could tell him.

It would be good to know what the next line means or can mean: "Mary on the other hand has given Gene more stuff on the phone than Harold did in person". Perhaps this accounts for Gene's knowing many things I did not want anyone to know and told few people, of whom Mary is not one. On the other hand, it could be him and Fred throwing dust.

If here becomes important for me to know your interpretation of "Before Gene got there Harold was kind enough to check with New Orleans (unknown to Gene at the time) to see if they still had any interest in Gene". Do you read any meaning other than the one above into it? The sentence that follows the one on Mary indicates the opposite meaning, "W icertainly wouldn't have sent Gene to Harold if I thought Harold would inform N.O. between Gene's first call and when Gene arrived". After your comment, I'll explain, if you'd like and remind me. But to answer your next question, I talked to no one about it and I wrote nothing to anyone you didn't get, I think to you on some and you and Paul on some. Your sentence I agree with: "Something seems very wrong here".

Please explain this sentence:"As I said, I told Fred in my letter to him that I could see reasons why you would not want Dave to have this stuff" What is "this stuff" and why is this a topic between you and Fred? I am baffled that, unless this is from the remote past, there should be anything like that in correspondence with any of those at best nuts. Having confronted Lifton's lies, is there any need for any further correspondence dealing with me? If I do not misunderstand this, it troubles me. I grant you it is now significant that we know the extent of their espionage and piecings together, but what a toll on your time it seems to be, and what strange things it gets you into....Why this closeness between Bradley and that bunch? Why should Fred have sent him to me (as I believe you told me you did).

Sylvia: agreed. Manchester: what is Dave's interest here? Makes little sense to me. Suggest also you say nothing to Fred about having raised Bradley matter with me. Unless you want to pursue second interpretation above....Psychological comparison and interpretation: also agreed. You may recall I'd indicated this belief to you and explained it not quite the same way, from the other side.

Take you you came out of the accident intact and with a still-running car.

Postscript on Dave and his methods; probable. Until I see this great new important thing he has, I'm more likely to consider it also of such origin. You here use language I have long suspected is valid:"If I were to assess it all now, I would say that Dave actibely attempts in a conscious fashion to do intelligence work on the rest of us and in my case, at least, to get unpublished stuff". As you also know, yours is not the only case. But, assume this to be true, for it is an obvious possibility. Without going into the reasons why, which are not central, does this not also suggest to you a general validity to what I have been trying to get you to understand? For this rest of this, two things must be true: this is wrong;it is a danger. Anyone in contact with him can, therefore, make an innocent slip. If you do not come to understand the basic needs of working where this exists-and it is folly to assume it is limited to him- you will come to be very sorry, and others will with you. And those who, recognizing he is contantly prying and harranguing, still trust him, will also. When it is too late.

Your final paragraph on Mary does not stand. I met her and Arch in the summer, at least three months before you gave her this stack to copy. (It was wrong to carry all that with you, as it was wrong to give it without advance assurances of trustworthiness you lacked.) This is ample time to have sent me anything at all, even a volume of stuff. I will not ask again and I ask you to neither ask nor remind. More than anything else, I want accurate readings....Gary, I fear you are in this out of context, which can be fatal. This is a very serious business that represents great hazard to the most influenctial people in the world whose lack

of scruple and complete dedication you do not have to have explained to you. I also suggest Agnew's last night's speech, a gutteral echo of the 1930s, is neither an accident nor in a vacuum. I will not expand on this for it should not be necessary. Instead I ask you to think, to try and place all of what we do in such a context, this kind of environment, with two particular things in mind: what the consequences can be to us and the importance of success to the country. Now these are not only the rottenest people in control of the country and its enormous power, they are also desparate.

We have assumed and bear great burdens. Please stop adding to them needlessly. Mary tells me she and Arch are interested only in collecting all they can for their grandchildren, nothing else. I want nothing of mine to be added to such a futility. I'l work with people who want a decent world for their grandchildren, for people who want the truth now. But I have yet to be persuaded that for all the enormity of their work it isn't all on tengeants, on what will not stack up, on what is central and can help disclose and establish truth. I am looking forward to some indication you haven't just been swept off your feet. These people had my work and my address and never made any effort to get in touch with me, yet they are engaged on so enormous a project. Perhaps it is natural for them, but it is not the way I would have done were the positions reversed, nor is it what you would have. There is too much that requires answer where there is no real answer, too much that is neither what it appears to be or really satisfactory. As you have seen, even though they wouldn't ask me for it when I told them what I had that you asked me to send, I sent it. If they are completely open about this, they had it and didn't understand it at best. On the other hand, they also had what they knew I had worked on and made no gesture of helping me, for they did not know what I had. I did offer them access to my material, but notice they did not accept it when they were in a position to. The fact is, Bud had told them in advance I'd help them take them through the Archives, etc., but they neither wanted nor accepted this and didn't even phone me. The only reason we met is because Bud arranged it. I repeat, all of this and more may be no more than the kind of people they are. Now I want proof, for I did ask them for things they didn't send. The duplicate of the one page (and Mary should have suspected I had that) is all I have from them but the most effusive (and excessive) praise.

This has already taken too much time. I close with the encourangement that you think about and then apply a real, meaningful, non-emotional "need-to-know" basis for your generosity (which may include other people's materials?) and then only with dependable people, people of established, real dependability. I am unkind enough to remind you of your initial appraisal of Fred. We all have this problem. All of us are the kind who want to lead and have led open lives. This makes us marks for the other kind. How many more Liftons, Boxleys, Freds, Jaffe's, Burtons and others do you need to learn? Were it a hot iron, one would suffice. I've made the same mistakes, but earlier, when it meant less. Profit from my burns, if not your own.

Sincerely,